

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration, reexamination, and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication, at pages 1 and 4 of the Office Action, that the subject matters of Claims 13 and 15 are free of the prior art.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, beginning at page 2, Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 12, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, as reciting subject matters that allegedly are anticipated by *Caminez*. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

Claim 1 relates to an extraction tool having a combination of elements including, *inter alia*, an extracting tip on a body first end, the extracting tip having a front end and narrowing toward the front of the extraction tip, the extracting tip for being inserted with a cutting action into the threaded insert to be extracted, wherein at least a section of the extracting tip has the shape of a steep-angle truncated pyramid, and wherein the extracting tip comprises a true square cross section.

Claim 3 relates to an extraction tool having a combination of elements including, *inter alia*, an extracting tip on a body first end, the extracting tip having a front end and narrowing toward the front of the extraction tip, the extracting tip for being inserted with a cutting action into the threaded insert to be extracted, wherein at least a section of the extracting tip has the shape of a steep-angle truncated pyramid, wherein the extracting tip comprises a true square cross section, and wherein the angle of inclination of the faces of the truncated pyramid relative to the perpendicular is about 1.5°.

The prior art, including *Caminez*, fails to identically disclose or describe an extraction tool or method of using an extraction tool as recited in the combinations of the pending claims.

Caminez discloses, see Fig. 1, an extracting tool consisting of a head portion 1, a shank

portion 2, and a tapered end portion 3. The end portion 3 is tapered and has at least one sharp edge 6 which is intended to engage with only the first convolution of a coil to be extracted (see page 1, left col., lines 33-40). In a preferred embodiment, illustrated in Fig. 2, the portion 3 has a four-cornered cross-section, including two corners 6 that project in a 'hook-like' manner from an otherwise rectangular (or square) cross-section. The non-cutting portions, which according to *Caminez* are preferably in the shape of relatively blunt edges 6', are provided at a slightly smaller distance from the tool axis than the sharp edges 6 (see page 1, right col., lines 25-31, and Fig. 2). Furthermore, the tapered end portion has – when taken from the Figures of *Caminez* – a taper angle of about 5°. *Caminez* is otherwise silent about the taper angle of his device.

The special cross-section of the *Caminez* end portion 3, which differs from a true square cross-section (see Fig. 2) by the inclusion of the 'hook-like' corners 6, and the relatively large taper angle of about 5°, can cause some severe disadvantages, especially when the extracting tool is to be used in a gas turbine environment, where it is necessary to remove the coils from a location within the turbine which is not readily accessible through the small inspection holes:

(1) While the tapered end portion 3 of the *Caminez* tool can be used for coils with various diameters, due to the relatively big taper angle, the sharp edges - on the other hand- engage only with the first convolution of the coil, which may be enough to unscrew the coil, but which is by far not enough to truly fix the coil on the tapered end portion 3 such that it can be safely removed through a small inspection hole from the inner parts of a gas turbine, or the like; and (2) The situation becomes worse, because only two of the four edges, *i.e.*, the sharp edges 6, engage with the first convolution, thereby leaving enough place for the coil to be deformed during extraction from the circular shape into a more elliptical shape and then disengage from the sharp edges 6.

The extraction tool according to the present invention differs from that of *Caminez* by including a true square cross-section for the tapered end portion and by choosing a substantially steeper taper angle, which is preferably about 1.5°. As described in this application, the true square cross-section ensures that all four edges engage with the windings of the coil, thereby substantially reducing the risk of the coil slipping from the tapered end due to coil deformation. The steep angle of the truncated pyramid makes certain that all four edges not only engage with

the first convolution, but with a plurality of subsequent convolutions of the coil, thereby establishing a strong connection between the coil and the tool, even when the coil has already been unscrewed.

Accordingly, *Caminez* fails to identically disclose or describe an extraction tool having a combination of elements as recited in Claims 1 and 3, nor does *Caminez* identically describe or describe a method of using an extracting tool as recited in Claim 12.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matters of Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 12, and 17 are not anticipated by *Caminez*, are therefore not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection thereof under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, beginning at page 6, Claims 4-7, 9, 11, 14, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as reciting subject matters that allegedly are obvious, and therefore allegedly unpatentable, over *Caminez* alone. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

Caminez fails to disclose, describe, or fairly suggest the subject matters of Claims 1 and 3, and likewise fails to make up for these deficiencies as well as the combinations recited in Claims 4-7, 9, 11, 14, and 16. That is, assuming *arguendo* that one of ordinary skill in the art would somewhere find motivation to modify *Caminez* to supply the specific limitations missing from Claims 4-7, 9, 11, 14, and 16, the resulting hypothetical construct would still not include each and every limitation recited in the full combinations of those claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matters of Claims 4-7, 9, 11, 14, and 16, each taken as a whole, would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant’s invention, are therefore not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection thereof under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

New Claims

Claims 18-31 have been added, all of which are dependent claims and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they each depend. Claim 3 has been placed in independent form, with Claims 18-25 and 28-30 depending therefrom, while Claim 26 depends from method Claim 12 and recites subject matter derived from original Claim 3; Claims 27 and 31 depend from Claim 26, and are thus allowable for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the present patent application is in condition for allowance. An early indication of the allowability of this patent application is therefore respectfully solicited.

If the patent examiner believes that a telephone conference with the undersigned would expedite passage of this patent application to issue, they are invited to call on the number below.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. If, however, additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees necessitated by this paper, and to credit all refunds and overpayments, to our Deposit Account 50-2821.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Adam J. Cermak/
Adam J. Cermak
Registration No. 40,391

U.S. P.T.O. Customer Number 36844

Cermak & Kenealy LLP
515 E. Braddock Rd., Suite B
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

703.778.6609 (v)
703.652.5101 (f)

Date: 17 January 2006